

REMARKS

In the Office Action, all claims (19-35) stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,272,470 to Teshima in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2001/0018659 to Koritzinsky. As applied to canceled claims 31-35, this ground of rejection is moot. As applied to pending claims 19-30, the Applicant traverses the rejection for the following reasons.

Each of independent claims 19 and 25 recites that the display screen is controlled to display first or second screens. The first screen comprises a Patient's Name field for displaying a patient's name and an Exam Description field for displaying an exam description. The second screen comprises a multiplicity of Exam Description fields in list format for displaying a corresponding multiplicity of exam descriptions in a stored linked list of exam descriptions arranged in alphabetic order, an Edit field in which the operator can enter an exam description to be added to said linked list, and a first activation zone for activating the insertion in alphabetic order of the exam description in said Edit field to said displayed list of exam descriptions in response to clicking on said first activation zone via said operator interface. The display screen is further controlled to display an updated version of the first screen in place of the second screen in response to selection of one of said exam descriptions displayed on the second screen via the operator interface followed by a third selection input by

the operator. When this occurs, the Exam Description field of the updated version of the first screen will display the selected exam description. Thus each claim recites a system programmed to perform two distinct functions: (1) inserting a new exam description (contained in the Edit field) into the linked list, both the list and the Edit field being displayed on the second screen; and (2) filling an Exam Description field on an updated version of the first screen with an exam description selected from the linked list by the system operator. Neither of these functions is disclosed in either Teshima or Koritzinsky.

The Examiner concedes that the foregoing functions cannot be found in Teshima, but asserts that they are disclosed by Koritzinsky. However, no support for the latter interpretation of Koritzinsky can be found in the action. The Examiner cites to paragraphs 0062-0064 on page 8 of Koritzinsky, but close scrutiny reveals that these passages make no mention of an Edit field for adding exam descriptions to a displayed list. Also, they make no mention of automatically filling an Exam Description field on a newly displayed screen in response to selection of an exam description appearing in a displayed list on a previously displayed different screen. In truth, the Examiner has done no more than paraphrase Applicant's claim language and then summarily conclude, without evidentiary support, that Koritzinsky "suggests" the recited features. On the contrary, Koritzinsky suggests nothing of the sort and certainly does not disclose any of the recited features.

While Koritzinsky discloses a display screen that displays a list of examination protocols (see Figure 11), the only disclosure relating to the manner in which the list is created appears on page 8 in ¶ 0063, which states as follows:

. . . not only are the protocols displayed for reference purposes at the diagnostic system, but new or additional protocols may be added to the listing from time to time, such as by downloading from the service facility.


(Emphasis added.)

Thus, Koritzinsky, in fact, teaches away from Applicant's claimed invention, which enables the system operator to add entries to the displayed list by interacting with a graphical user interface at the remote site, without recourse to the service facility. Furthermore, Koritzinsky is silent concerning selecting an entry on the list of protocols for display in an Exam Description field on a different screen.

Accordingly, the Applicant submits that the obviousness rejection based on Koritzinsky is mistaken. The Applicant respectfully requests that the obviousness rejection be withdrawn and that claims 19-30 be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

January 7, 2004  
Date


  
Dennis M. Flaherty  
Reg. No. 31,159  
Ostrager Chong & Flaherty LLP  
825 Third Avenue, 30<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10022-7519  
Tel. No.: 212-826-6565

Atty. Docket: 15-UL-5584

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: MS Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date set forth below.

January 7, 2004  
Date

  
Dennis M. Flaherty